DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 021 200 AC 002 697

By- Alexander, Frank D.; Engelbrecht, Walda M.

FEES FOR HOME ECONOMICS LEADER TRAINING AND TEACHING OF SPECIAL GROUPS: COUNTY HOME ECONOMICS DIVISIONS, NEW YORK COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SPECIAL REPORT, NUMBER 16.

State Univ. of New York, Ithaca Coll. of Agriculture at Cornell.; State Univ. of New York, Ithaca Coll. of Home Economics at Cornell Univ.

Pub Date Aug 68

Note- 26p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.12

Descriptors- ATTENDANCE, ATTITUDES, EVALUATION, *EXTENSION AGENTS, FINANCIAL POLICY, *GROUP INSTRUCTION, *HOME ECONOMICS EDUCATION, LEADERSHIP TRAINING, PROGRAM LENGTH, RESEARCH, *TUITION

Identifiers- Cooperative Extension Service, *New York State

A study was made to determine the fee practices of New York State county home economics divisions with regard to leader training and teaching of special interest groups. Completed questionnaires were received from 52 home economics divisions. Of this number, 23 divisions had a fee policy and 24 others lacking such a policy gave eight classes of reasons for not having one. Data were obtained on sources of fees, collection, duration of fee policies, length of regular training classes, class atendance, special interest classes, agents' evaluations(largely favorable) of the effects of fee policies, and members' complaints (apparently very few) about fees for special interest classes. It was concluded that the development of fee policies should be considered at regional and state meetings, as well as by divisional and other home economics extension leaders. (The document includes 12 tables.) (ly)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FEES FOR HOME ECONOMICS LEADER TRAINING AND TEACHING OF SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS

County Home Economics Divisions
New York Cooperative Extension

Special Report No. 16

Office of Extension Studies
New York State Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics
Statutory Colleges of the State University
at Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

August, 1968

ED021200

Author: Frank D. Alexander, Extension Studies Analyst
in cooperation with
Walda M. Engelbrecht, Cooperative Extension Agent

PREFACE

This report is the result of the initiative of Walda Engelbrecht, Cooperative Extension Agent in the Home Economics Division of the Chenango County Cooperative Extension. It is a descriptive report relating to the fee practices for leader training and teaching of special interest classes conducted by the 52 home economics divisions in New York State.

The report should provide the basis for a thorough consideration by the divisions as well as the extension administrators and supervisors in the College of Home Economics of fee policy and practice for the services rendered by the divisional staffs in the counties.

The Office of Extension Studies welcomed the opportunity to process the data of the divisional survey and write the report based thereon. It is hoped that other agents will be stimulated to make investigations of divisional policies and practices. If interests of this kind should develop, the Office would recommend that the agents consult with the Studies staff on all aspects of the survey before it is initiated. This joint consultation should result in more effective management of data collection and processing and in the preparation of a report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Summary of Findings	1
Observations About Findings	6
Introduction	7
Extent of Returns	8
Leadership Training	8
Policy on Fees	8
Fees Charged	9
Number of Years Have Charged Fees	11
Collection of Fees	11
By Whom Fees Paid	11
Length of Leader Training Classes for Which Fees Are Charged	13
Attendance at Leadership Training Classes Since Fees Have Been Charged	13
Special Interest Classes	14
Policy on Fee Charges	14
Fixed Fees	15
Variations in Non-fixed Fees	16
Number of Years Have Charged Fees	17
Collection of Fees	17
Length of Special Interest Classes for Which Fees Have Been Charged	19
Attendance of Pre-registrants at Special Interest Classes Since Fees Have Been Charged	20
Agents' Opinions Regarding Value of Fees for Attendance at Special Interest Classes	20
Agents' Opinions Regarding Influence of Fees on Attendance at a Series of Lessons	21
Agents' Opinions Regarding Effect of Fees on Image of Extension Classes	21
Complaints of Members About Fees for Special Interest Classes	21

FEES FOR HOME ECONOMICS LEADER TRAINING AND TEACHING OF SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS

County Home Economics Divisions
New York Cooperative Extension

Summary of Findings

I. Introduction

A. Purpose of study

1. To determine the fee practices of the county home economics divisions with regard to leader training and teaching of special interest groups.

B. Returns

1. Completed questionnaires were received from 52 home economics divisions. Three of these divisions serve two counties each.[1]

II. Leadership Training

A. Policy on fees

1. Of 52 divisions reporting, 23, or 44 percent, had a policy for charging leader training fees.
2. Twenty-four of the 29 divisions having no policy gave eight classes of reasons for not having a policy.

---

[1] Since three divisions serve two counties each, the unit of analysis used throughout most of the study is division rather than county. Each of these pairs of counties was treated as one division. In a few instances the agents who responded to the questionnaire served as the unit of analysis.

B. Fees charged

1. The 23 divisions having a fee policy fell into two classes, i.e., those charging a fee per leader and those charging a fee per group (club).

2. There was considerable variation in amount of fixed fees charged by the 23 divisions having a policy.

3. The modal fee for the per leader class of divisions was cost of materials--no set fee; for the per group class, it was $1.00.

C. Number of years have charged fees

1. Most (20) of the 23 divisions with a policy have been charging a fee for a year.

D. Collection of fees

1. Two principal methods have been used: 1) at the door and 2) by mail prior to class.

E. By whom fees paid

1. Nine divisions reported fees paid by the group (club), eight either group or individual, and six did not know.

F. Length of leader training classes for which fees are charged

1. Two-hour classes predominated with a range from one hour to four hours.

G. Attendance at leadership training classes since fees have been charged

1. Of the 23 divisions with a policy, nine, or 39 percent, indicated an attendance decline since the policy was initiated.

2. None of the nine attributed the decline directly to the charging of fees.

III. Special Interest Classes

A. Policy on fee charges

1. Of the 52 divisions, 39, or 75 percent, had a policy on fees for special interest classes, and 10 of the 13 which had no policy had some kinds of charges for these classes.

B. Fixed fees

1. Of the 44 divisions reporting, only five, or 11 percent, had a fixed fee for special interest classes.[1]
2. Of the five divisions having fixed fees, two charged 50 cents per person per lesson and three $1.00.[2]

C. Variations in non-fixed fees

1. Some 17 different answers were given by the 37 divisions reporting.
2. The major considerations involved in determination of these fees were: 1) cost of materials or supplies (22 mentions) and 2) number of lessons (10 mentions).

D. Number of years have charged fees

1. Of the 42 divisions reporting and charging fees, 16, or 38 percent, had charged them for one year or less and another 10, or 24 percent, for only

---

[1] One division having a policy on fees and seven having no policy gave information on this question.

[2] While not clearly stated, it is believed that the definition of the $1.00 fee was per person per lesson. One of the two divisions which charged 50 cents per person per lesson had this charge for members of the home economics division and $1.00 for nonmembers.

two years.[1]

E. Collection of fees

1. Of the 42 divisions reporting, 36 percent collect their fees for special interest classes by mail prior to the class, 31 percent collect at the door, 26 percent either by mail or at the door, and seven percent use some other procedure.[1]

F. Length of special interest classes for which fees have been charged

1. The length of the special interest classes for which fees have been charged has varied greatly from one hour to a whole day.

2. Two-hour classes were the ones most frequently reported.[2]

G. Attendance of pre-registrants at special interest classes since fees have been charged

1. Of the 39 divisions reporting, 49 percent indicated that the attendance of pre-registrants was higher than before fees were charged, 26 percent thought it was about the same, five percent thought it lower, and 20 percent either did not know or said it was too soon to tell.[3]

---

[1] No response was obtained from 10 of the 52 divisions because the respondents apparently did not consider the question applied.

[2] No response was obtained from 10 of the 52 divisions because the respondents apparently did not consider question applied. An additional division appeared to have overlooked the question.

[3] No response was obtained from 10 of the 52 divisions because the respondents apparently did not consider question applied. Another three gave no information.

H. Agents' opinions regarding value of fees for attendance at special interest classes

1. Of the 30 agents who expressed an opinion, 22, or 73 percent, thought fees had a positive value for attendance.[1]

I. Agents' opinions regarding influence of fees on attendance at a series of lessons

1. Of the 36 agents who expressed an opinion, 25, or 69 percent, thought that fees had influenced continued attendance for serial lessons.[2]

J. Agents' opinions regarding effect of fees on image of extension classes

1. Of the 39 agents who expressed an opinion, 20, or 51 percent, thought charging fees had improved the image of extension classes, whereas only 8, or 21 percent, thought charging fees had not improved the image.[3]

K. Complaints of members about fees for special interest classes

1. Ninety percent of 40 divisions reporting indicated no complaints.[4]

---

[1] No response was obtained from 10 of the 52 agent respondents because they apparently did not consider question applied, and 12 gave no information.

[2] Two divisions had no series, four agents gave no information, and 10 did not answer question, apparently because it was not considered applicable.

[3] No response was obtained from 10 of the 52 agent respondents because they apparently did not consider question applied, and an additional three gave no information.

[4] Two divisions did not charge members fees, and for 10 divisions the respondents evidently considered the question not applicable and hence gave no answer.

Observations About Findings

1. A number of the home economics divisions have developed fee policies for leader training. Other divisions may want to give consideration to the matter. Perhaps this is a topic to be considered at regional and state meetings of divisional leaders with consideration being given to the need for both uniformity and diversity.

2. A good majority of the divisions have policies regarding fees for teaching special interest classes. Those divisions which have no policy may want to learn from those that have the advantages or disadvantages of such a policy. Perhaps this is another topic to be considered at regional and state meetings of divisional leaders with consideration being given to the need for both uniformity and diversity.

3. The facts of this report should provide a basis for the discussion of both kinds of fees by divisional leaders.

4. Administrators and supervisors of the home economics division at the college should acquaint themselves with the situation as described in this report and consider what position they may wish to take, or what advice to give, with regard to fees for leader training and teaching special interest classes.

FEES FOR HOME ECONOMICS LEADER TRAINING AND TEACHING OF SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS

County Home Economics Divisions
New York Cooperative Extension

Introduction

This study was initiated by Walda Engelbrecht, Cooperative Extension Agent in Chenango County, and was undertaken to provide a basis for policy determination in her county regarding charging fees for leader training and the teaching of special interest groups. Miss Engelbrecht prepared a two page questionnaire which was sent to the leader of the Home Economics Division in each county in the state. The questionnaire sought to obtain from the agents the practice and experience of their divisions with respect to fees for leader training and for teaching special interest groups. At the suggestion of Lucinda Noble, Associate Director of Extension, the Office of Extension Studies offered to process the data and prepare a report based thereon. After making a final effort to obtain questionnaires from divisional leaders who had not responded, Miss Engelbrecht transmitted all of the questionnaires which she had received to the Office of Extension Studies.

In view of the decision which the Home Economics Division made in 1967 to withdraw from its role of actively sponsoring unit organizations, it is appropriate for the home economics agents to be concerned with the formulation of policy with respect to their role in home economics leadership training which includes women associated with the study groups that have evolved from the former units or with study groups other than these. It is also timely for considering policy with regard to servicing an increasing number of special interest groups concerned with home economics education.

An important aspect of this concern has been the payment of fees for training and teaching. It is with this specific interest that this report deals.

Extent of Returns

Questionnaires were received from all 52 Home Economics Divisions in the state. Three of these divisions serve two counties each.[1] One of the state's 56 counties has no Home Economics Division.

Leadership Training

Policy on Fees

Of the 52 divisions reporting, 23, or 44 percent, indicated that there was a policy for charging fees for leader training (Table 1). Thus, almost half of the divisions had some kind of policy that involved charging fees for leader training. One division that no longer has such a policy had discontinued it in February, 1968.

Table 1

Number and Percentage Distribution of Divisions According to Whether or Not Division Has Policy for Charging Fees for Leader Training: Spring, 1968

Policy on fees for leader training	Divisions	
	Number	Percent
Yes	23[a]	44
No	29[b]	56
Total	52	100

[a]One division charged $1.00 for non-members only. Another division held all classes as combination leader training and special interest program workshops.

[b]One division which discontinued its fee policy in February, 1968 had charged $1.00. Five divisions charged for various materials, charge bulletins, and kits; another had charged for one specific bulletin. Two divisions had held no leader training classes. Two divisions indicated that they may charge fees in the future.

[1]Since three divisions serve two counties each, the unit of analysis used throughout most of the study is division rather than county. Each of these pairs of counties was treated as one division. In a few instances the agents who responded to the questionnaire served as the unit of analysis.

A variety of reasons for not having a fee policy were given by 24 of the 29 divisions not having such a policy. The reasons given were classified under the following categories:

		No. of divisions
1.	Membership or enrollment fee gives women the privilege of attending leader training	4
2.	No definite policy but charge depending on amount and type of material distributed	4
3.	No policy made since reorganization; have not decided on fee in order to allow for transition period for former units	4
4.	Have not found it necessary	4
5.	Have wanted to encourage people to come-- not keep them away, since it should be made available to all groups	3
6.	Leaders spend time and effort to take training and help with teaching so they should not be expected to pay	2
7.	No leader training classes conducted this year	2
8.	Tried charging $1.00 enrollment fee, but it caused a drop in attendance so was discontinued	1

It would be difficult to challenge most of the reasons for not having a fee policy. It is possible that the four divisions which fall in category 3 may, after further lapse of time for the members of former units to adjust to the new situation, adopt some kind of fee policy.

Fees Charged

There were two classes of divisions according to types of fees charged for leader training, i.e., a per group (club) fee which permitted more than one person per group to attend and an individual fee. Of the 23 divisions having a fee policy, 10 had per club fees and 13 a per leader fee. The distribution of the divisions according to fees for each of these two categories is given in Table 2.

Table 2

Number and Percentage Distribution of Divisions Having a Fee Policy According to Fees Charged For Leader Training per Leader and per Group

Fees charged	Divisions: Number: Per leader	Divisions: Number: Per group	Divisions: Percent: Per leader	Divisions: Percent: Per group
.50	1	---	8	---
1.00	5	6[c]	38	60
2.00	1[a]	1[d]	8	10
5.00	---	1	---	10
Cost of materials--no set fee	6[b]	2[e]	46	20
Total	13	10	100	100

[a] A charge of $5.00 was made for more than three projects and a charge of $10.00 for second leader.

[b] One division charged half price for more than one leader; one division charged on a per leader basis if extra leaders got materials, and another charged 50 cents to $1.50 for members and $1.00 to $2.00 for non-members.

[c] One division charged $1.00 if only one packet of materials was taken, and another indicated only one leader was allowed per club. This division also charged for cost of charge bulletins.

[d] Division permitted two leaders per group.

[e] One division had an extra charge for an extra set of materials and also based charge on number of classes in series.

Of the 23 divisions which had a fee policy for leader training, 15, or 65 percent, had one set fee charge with eight, or 35 percent, having no fixed charge. There was considerable variation in amount of fees which, as the footnotes to Table 2 indicate, involved a number of special considerations. The modal

fee for the per leader class of divisions was cost of materials--no set fee; for the per group class it was $1.00.

Number of Years Have Charged Fees

According to Table 3, most (20, or 87 percent) of the 23 divisions with a policy have been charging a fee for a year. Only two divisions reported having fees for five or more years.

Table 3

Number and Percentage Distribution of Divisions Having a Fee Policy According to Number of Years Fee Has Been Charged for Leader Training

Number of years	Divisions	
	Number	Percent
1 year	20[a]	87
5 years	1	4
Many years	1	4
Don't know	1	4
Total	23	99[b]

[a]Includes two who specified this year and one who said 1.5 years.

[b]Does not add to 100 because of rounding.

Collection of Fees

Two principal methods have been used for collecting fees, i.e., 1) at the door (nine), and 2) by mail prior to class (eight), with a few (three) using both methods (Table 4).

By Whom Fees Paid

Nine of the divisions reported that the group (club) from which the leader came paid the training fee, eight reported that either the group or the individual paid, and six had no idea as to who paid (Table 5).

Table 4

Number and Percentage Distribution of Divisions Having a Fee Policy According to Method Of Handling Collection of Fees

Method of handling collection of fees	Divisions	
	Number	Percent
At door	9	39
By mail prior to class	8	35
At door and by mail	3	13
By mail and other	2[a]	9
Other	1[b]	4
Total	23	100

[a]One division also collected at meeting from individuals who had not enrolled by mail, since some come as a result of newspaper promotion. In the other division, clubs paid in June when enrolled for year or by mail before training school if they had added program. No refunds were given but enrollment could be transferred to another project if leader missed training school.

[b]Collected at meeting--passed an envelope with the roll sheet and had each mark paid and make own change.

Table 5

Number and Percentage Distribution of Divisions Having a Fee Policy According to Who Pays the Fee

By whom fee paid	Divisions	
	Number	Percent
The club	9	39
Mixed (either leader or club)	8	35
No idea (don't know)	6	26
Total	23	100

Length of Leader Training Classes for Which Fees Are Charged

Two-hour classes predominated (Table 6). However, the length of training sessions varied considerably with a range from one hour to four hours.

Table 6

Number and Percentage Distribution of Divisions Having a Fee Policy According to Length Of Leader Training Classes

Length of leader training classes[a]	Divisions	
	Number	Percent
1 - 1.5 hours	1	4
1.5 - 2 hours	3	13
1.5 - 4 hours	1	4
2 hours	9	39
2 - 3 hours	3	13
2 - 4 hours	1	4
2.5 hours	1	4
3 hours	2	9
4 hours	2	9
Total	23	99[b]

[a]The overlapping of the limits of what appear to be class limits is due to the manner in which the length of classes was reported. Actually the designations of length of classes were frequently the ranges of time for which different classes had been conducted.

[b]Does not add to 100 because of rounding.

Attendance at Leadership Training Classes Since Fees Have Been Charged

Of the 23 divisions which had a fee policy for leader training, nine, or 39 percent, indicated that attendance had declined in leadership training classes since the fee policy

was inaugurated.[1] The reasons given by the nine divisions for the decline in attendance were:

	Number of divisions
Decline due to reorganization of program and loss of units	5
Decline due to change in program emphasis	2
Attendance had been declining	2
Total	9

Thus, actually no division attributed the decline in attendance directly to the charging of a fee. It is difficult to know whether or not the decline due to change in program was identical with the decline due to reorganization of program and loss of units, the reason for decline in attendance given by the largest number (five) of the divisions. However, it is not unlikely that both reasons were closely associated with discontinuing organizational ties with units. The explanation that attendance had been declining might very well have placed the two divisions giving this reason in the category of no decline since fees had been charged. Evidently the agents reporting for these two divisions saw some relationship of fees to a continuation of a decline in attendance that had already begun.

Special Interest Classes

Policy on Fee Charges

Of the 52 divisions, 39, or 75 percent, had a policy on fees

---

[1] Of the 14 divisions which indicated no decline in attendance since fees were inaugurated, one reported that attendance at leader training meetings had declined steadily prior to fees, and another that attendance had declined because of change-over from units.

for special interest classes (Table 7). Ten of the 13 divisions which had no policy indicated some kinds of charges were made in connection with special interest classes (See footnote b, Table 7).

Table 7

Number and Percentage Distribution of Divisions According to Whether or Not Division Has Policy for Charging Fees for Special Interest Classes

Policy on fees for special interest classes	Divisions	
	Number	Percent
Yes	39[a]	75
No	13[b]	25
Total	52	100

[a]One division charged fee for non-members who are then considered members.

[b]No policy but charges or plans to charge: Five divisions had no policy but did have certain charges; one division charged only nominal fees but did not indicate whether or not had a policy; one division charged $1.00 from September, 1967 to February, 1968, but dropped plan in February, 1968; one division charged for materials and charge bulletins (this division has had a fee of $8.50 each for its reupholstering and tailoring classes); one division plans to charge fees; one division may have a charge depending on material used; and one division provides teaching materials free to leaders but charges class members two cents a page for mimeographs.

Fixed Fees

Of the 44 divisions reporting, only five, or 11 percent, had a fixed fee for special interest classes, while 39, or 89 percent, had no set fee (Table 8). Of the five divisions which

had fixed fees, two charged 50 cents per person per lesson[1] and three $1.00.[2]

Table 8

Number and Percentage Distribution of Divisions According to Whether or Not One Set Fee Is Charged For Special Interest Classes

One set fee charged	Divisions Number	Percent
Yes	5	11
No	39	89
Total	44[a]	100

[a]One division having a policy on fees and seven having no policy gave no information on this question.

Variations in Non-fixed Fees

Some 17 different answers were given by the 37 divisions reporting on variances in non-fixed fees. The considerations

[1]One of these divisions charged 50 cents per member per lesson and $1.00 for non-members.

[2]While not always clearly stated, it is believed that the definition of the $1.00 fee was per person per lesson.

for determining fees which appeared in these answers were:

Considerations	Number of mentions (N=37)
Cost of materials or supplies (bulletins, leaflets, etc.)	22
Number of lessons	10
Pay of teacher (usually a county leader)	6
Total cost of class	5
Rental of space	4
Length of lesson	3
Charge for unusual classes, i.e., tailoring, clothing, upholstering	2
Cost of promotion	2
Type of lesson	2
Ability of enrollee to pay	1
Number in class	1
Time required to teach	1

Number of Years Have Charged Fees

Almost two fifths (38 percent) of the 42 divisions reporting had charged fees for special classes for one year or less, and almost another one fourth (24 percent) for only two years (Table 9). Only four, or 10 percent, of the 42 divisions had charged fees for as many as five or six years.

Collection of Fees

Over one third (36 percent) of the 42 divisions reporting collect the fees for their special interest classes by mail prior to the class, almost one third (31 percent) collect at the door, and about one fourth (26 percent) collect either by mail or at the door (Table 10). Thus, 93 percent of the 42 divisions either collect their fees by mail, at the door, or by both methods.

Table 9

Number and Percentage Distribution of Divisions According to Number of Years Fee Has Been Charged for Special Interest Classes

Number of years	Divisions	
	Number	Percent
One year or less	16	38
Two years	10	24
Three years	6	14
Four years	3	7
Five years	2	5
Six years	2	5
Several years	2	5
Don't know	1	2
Total	42[a]	100

[a]No response from 10 of the 52 divisions included in the study because the respondents apparently did not consider question applied; however, one of these 10 charged fees.

Table 10

Number and Percentage Distribution of Divisions According to How Collection of Fees for Special Interest Classes Is Handled

How fees are collected	Divisions	
	Number	Percent
At door	13	31
By mail prior to class	15[a]	36
At door and by mail	11[b]	26
Beginning and end of class or during class	2	5
Other[c]	1	2
Total	42[d]	100

[a]One also collects during series.

[b]One specified "by mail preferred."

[c]No explanation given regarding this.

[d]No response from 10 of the 52 divisions included in the study because the respondents apparently did not consider question applied; however, one of the 10 charged fees.

Length of Special Interest Classes for Which Fees Have Been Charged

The length of special interest classes for which fees have been charged has varied widely, from one hour to a whole day (Table 11). Two-hour classes were the ones most frequently reported. As high as 40 percent of the divisions reported classes ranging from three hours to a full day.

Table 11

Number and Percentage Distribution of Divisions According to Length of Special Interest Classes Per Session

Length of special interest classes[a]	Divisions	
	Number	Percent
1 - 1.5 hours	1	2
1.5 - 2 hours	1	2
2 hours	9	22
2 - 3 or 3.5 hours	4	10
2 - 4 hours	4	10
2 - 5 hours	1	2
3 hours	2	5
3 - 4 hours	5	12
4 hours	3	7
4 - 5 hours	1	2
5 hours	2	5
1 - 6 hours	1	2
2 - 6 hours	2	5
.5 - 1 day	1	2
Depends or varies	4	10
Total	41[b]	98[c]

[a]The overlapping of the limits of what appear to be class limits is due to the manner in which the length of classes was reported. Actually the designations of length of classes were frequently the ranges of time for which different classes had been conducted.

[b]No response obtained from 10 of the 52 divisions involved in the study because the respondents apparently did not consider question applied. However, one of the 10 charged fees. An additional division appeared to have overlooked the question.

[c]Does not add to 100 because of rounding.

Attendance of Pre-registrants at Special Interest Classes Since Fees Have Been Charged

Almost half (49 percent) of the divisions (39) reported that attendance of pre-registrants was higher than before fees were charged and about another one fourth (26 percent) reported attendance about the same (Table 12). Only two divisions reported attendance lower than before, and one fifth, 20 percent, did not know or stated it was too soon to know.

Table 12

Number and Percentage Distribution of Divisions According to Attendance of Pre-registrants Since Fees Charged

Attendance of pre-registrants since fees charged	Divisions	
	Number	Percent
Higher than before	19	49
Lower than before	2	5
About the same	10	26
Too soon to tell	4	10
Don't know	4	10
Total	39[a]	100

[a]No response from 10 of the 52 divisions involved in the study because the respondents apparently did not consider question applied; however, one of the 10 charged fees. Another three gave no information on this question.

Agents' Opinions Regarding Value of Fees for Attendance at Special Interest Classes

Only 30 agents expressed an opinion as to the value of fees for attendance at special interest classes.[1] Twenty-two, or 73

[1]For 10 divisions the respondents apparently did not consider the question applicable, and no information was obtained from the agents in 12 other divisions.

percent, of the 30 thought it had a positive value for attendance, seven did not think it had any value for attendance and one did not know.

Agents' Opinions Regarding Influence of Fees on Attendance at a Series of Lessons

Of the 36 agents reporting,[1] 25, or 69 percent, thought that fees had influenced continued attendance for serial lessons; 6, or 17 percent, indicated no influence; and 5, or 14 percent, did not know or considered it too soon to tell.

Agents' Opinions Regarding Effect of Fees on Image of Extension Classes

About one half (51 percent) of the 39 responding agents thought charging fees had improved the image of extension classes (Table 13). Only 8, or 21 percent, thought the fees had not improved the image of extension classes. Another 11, or 28 percent, did not know or had mixed feelings.

Complaints of Members About Fees for Special Interest Classes

Of the 40 divisions reporting 36, or 90 percent, indicated no complaint from members about fees for special interest classes. Two divisions answered both yes and no to the question about members' complaints and two answered yes.[2]

---

[1] Two divisions had had no series, four gave no information on this question, and 10 did not answer the question, apparently because it was not considered applicable.

[2] Two divisions did not charge members any fees, and for 10 divisions the respondents evidently considered the question not applicable and hence gave no answer.

Table 13

Number and Percentage Distribution of Divisions According to Whether Agent Feels Charging Fees Has Improved The Image of Extension Classes

Charging fees has improved the image of extension classes	Divisions	
	Number	Percent
Yes	20	51
No	8	21
Too soon to tell	5	13
Don't know or mixed feelings	6	15
Total	39[a]	100

[a]No response obtained from 10 of the 52 divisions involved in study because the respondents apparently did not consider question applied; however, one of the 10 charged fees. An additional three gave no information on this question.

ERIC Clearinghouse
AUG21 1968
on Adult Education